

Gallatin Resource Advisory Committee

Project Evaluation Criteria

Name of Reviewer: _____ Category: _____

Project Name: _____ Primary Contact: _____

Brief Project Description: _____

Type of Project: (circle type)

1. Road, trail, and infrastructure maintenance, decommissioning, or obliteration*
2. Soil productivity improvement
3. Improvements in forest ecosystem health
4. Watershed restoration and maintenance*
5. Restoration, maintenance and improvement of wildlife and fish habitat
6. Control of noxious and exotic weeds
7. Re-establishment of native species

* A minimum of 50% of funds must be allocated to categories 1 and 4.

Project Ranking Criteria

The Gallatin RAC will divide applications received into two groups:

- Large projects over \$15,000
- Small projects less than \$15,000

It is the RAC's intent to recommend that approximately 50% of the funds be awarded to small projects, and 50% to large projects. A minimum of 50% of the project funds must be allocated to Categories 1 and 4.

Projects will be ranked individually by the 15-member RAC based on their Project Feasibility / Economics and Social Impact. The ranking criteria will be evaluated based on a score of 1 (low) to 5 (high). Criteria of particular importance to the RAC shall be multiplied by a factor of 2 or 3 for a total of 100 points. The individual scores will then be combined for a cumulative score (1500 total). The RAC will meet to discuss project proposals, and may request interviews with applicants prior to making a final recommendation to the Forest Service.

Rate Project Feasibility and Economics:

1. Project duration, volunteer labor/time. Time intensive projects with many participants should be rated higher than projects of short duration with only a few participants.
_____ x 1 = _____
2. Experience / qualifications of volunteers and/or employees working on project.
_____ x 1 = _____
3. Ability of the project to be completed with the amount of funds requested, including in kind and/or matching funds. Projects with higher matching/in kind funds should be rated higher than projects with little or no matching/in kind funds.
_____ x 2 = _____
4. Size of project (acres, miles, or other measurement). Projects having a larger impact should be rated higher.
_____ x 2 = _____
5. Assessment of monitoring plan, which provides milestones/assessments for phased projects over multiple years.
_____ x 2 = _____
6. Has project planning, fieldwork, and environmental review been completed? Have permits been acquired? Does planning, field work, and/or environmental review and/or permit acquisition need to be completed? Projects ready to be implemented should be rated higher.
_____ x 2 = _____

50 points possible

Subtotal: _____

Rate Social Impact:

1. Improve public safety (examples include hazardous fuels reduction, improved access, etc.)
_____ x 2 = _____
2. Economic benefit to community, including private sector jobs, other jobs, and revenue generated. Projects generating private sector jobs should be rated higher.
_____ x 3 = _____
3. Educational value, such as interpretative signage (vista, historic, cultural, location, project accomplishment, etc.).
_____ x 1 = _____
4. Demonstrated public support, such as letters of support included with the application.
_____ x 1 = _____
5. Evaluation of benefits, such as improved quality of life, increased opportunities, improvements to natural resources, etc. Multiple social, economic, and environmental benefits, and projects with long term lasting benefit rate higher than single beneficial impacts and/or projects with temporary benefit.
_____ x 3 = _____

50 points possible

Subtotal: _____

100 points possible

Total Score: _____